

Serial No. 09/558,920  
In reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2005  
Page 12 of 14

#### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 7, 2005. Claims 19-36 and 46-75 are pending in the application. Claims 46-75 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 19-36 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 19, 24, and 28 are amended, and the remaining claims are unchanged.

Claims 19-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action in paragraph 7 on page 3 provides examples of claim clarity issues. Applicant has amended the claims in response to the Examiner's comments in order to clarify the scope of the claims. Applicant believes the claims now clarify the progression of the tax form from "expected tax form" to "selected tax form" to "completed selected tax form" to "filed tax form." In view of the clarifying amendments, Applicants request removal of the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 19-36 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as follows:

- a. 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Quicken on "TurboTax for the Web," and on two press release documents.
- b. 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention as evidenced by "TurboTax for the Web" and documents; and
- c. 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller and TurboTax as described in the TurboTax User's Guide.

Applicant respectfully submits that the clarifying amendments highlight the distinctions between the present claims and the prior art, and respectfully submit that the present claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art of record. Specifically, the claims have been amended to include the limitations of "an expected tax form" as distinguished from a "selected tax form" as further distinguished from a "completed selected tax form," and still further distinguished from a "filed tax form." Further still, the claims have been amended to provide for "receiving from the user a request for the record of the filed tax form to verify the filing of the completed selected tax form," and "sending the record of the filed tax form to the user across the network ... to verify that the filed tax form has been submitted." Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features are not shown or suggested in the prior art of record.

There is nothing in the prior art of record, including TurboTax for the Web, TurboTax Desk Top and Miller to teach or suggest the features of filing a tax form with a government entity

Serial No. 09/558,920  
In reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2005  
Page 13 of 14

and verifying that filing by requesting a record of the tax form from the government entity and then sending the record to the user over a network, wherein the record of the tax form is distinct from the filed tax form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102 be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 19-36 were alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art used to reject claims 19-36 based upon anticipation. It is the Examiner's principle position that the claims are anticipated because the prior art directly or inherently discloses all of the claimed features. If not inherent, however, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the prior art described above to include "well known features." These "well known features" are listed in the Office Action and include home networks, tax forms available over the internet, that the IRS stores tax payers' records, that electronic forms provide a more economical and efficient means of handling tax data, and that the tax entities send out tax forms to tax payers based on forms filed the year before. Applicant reserves the right to contest any factual determination or legal conclusion made in this rejection. For this response, Applicant points out that none of the cited references or the "well known features" show or suggests the limitations of the amended claims. In particular, the prior art does not show or suggest the two distinct claim steps of filing the tax form with the government entity, and verifying that filing by requesting the record of the tax form from a government entity over a network, wherein the record of the tax form is distinct from the filed tax form. Because these amended features are neither shown nor suggested in the prior art, Applicants respectfully requests removal of the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 103.

Serial No. 09/558,920  
In reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2005  
Page 14 of 14

Applicants respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (612) 607-7340. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees, including fees for any extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 50-1901 (Docket 60021-357601).

Respectfully submitted,

By

Rudolph P. Hofmann, Reg. #38,187  
Customer No. 29838

Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP  
45 South Seventh Street, Suite 3300  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
Telephone: 612.607.7340  
Facsimile: 612.607.7100  
E-mail: RHofmann@Oppenheimer.com